

WM  
28  
AN 4  
M858

## REPORT.

*To the Senate and General Assembly of the State of New Jersey :*

The committee appointed under concurrent resolution of the One Hundred and Twelfth Legislature of New Jersey to inquire into and investigate the management, government and discipline of the State Asylum for the Insane, at Morristown, N. J., would respectfully submit the following report :

Your committee was appointed by virtue of the following resolution :

“WHEREAS, Charges directly affecting the management, government and discipline of the State Asylum for the Insane, at Morristown, New Jersey, are made in the public prints and otherwise ; therefore,

“Resolved, That a special committee, to consist of three members of the Senate and five members of the House of Assembly, be appointed to inquire concerning the management, government and discipline of the State Asylum for the Insane, at Morristown, N. J., and whether any, and if so what, action should be taken in the premises.”

By a joint resolution passed subsequently to the passage of the resolution above quoted, your committee were authorized to sit during the recess of the Legislature.

Eight entire days were consumed in taking, with the aid of a stenographer, the testimony of witnesses upon the matters involved in the inquiry. One hundred and twenty-four different persons were examined as witnesses, and some of these were recalled and re-examined several times. The testimony so taken, as written out by the stenographer, covers over 1,400 type-written pages.

Your committee explored every quarter where it was suggested or seemed to them likely that information could be gained touching the matters under investigation. Every person suggested from any source as likely to be able to give testimony of importance, except where such

testimony appeared to be unnecessarily cumulative, was sought out and examined, if his attendance before the committee could be procured.

The charges referred to in the preamble of the resolution under which your committee was appointed, were found to be of two kinds—one affecting the official integrity of Martin B. Monroe, the Warden of the Asylum, and accusing him of dishonest conduct in making large sums of money by exacting bonuses and commissions from persons furnishing supplies to the Asylum, and also in using for the private supply of himself and his family articles bought and paid for by the State for Asylum uses. The second class of charges related to the business conduct and management of the institution under Mr. Monroe's wardenship in various particulars that will be more fully stated hereafter.

As to the first class of charges, your committee are happy, for the credit of the institution and of Mr. Monroe, to be able to report that they are unanimously of the opinion that these charges are entirely unfounded.

Nearly all the principal dealers that have furnished supplies to the Asylum during Mr. Monroe's term as Warden were called, and testified that the houses they represent had never allowed to Mr. Monroe, or to any one for him, either directly or indirectly, any fee, bonus or commission whatever, for the custom given them by Mr. Monroe; that Mr. Monroe had never asked for or suggested any such compensation, and that as a matter of fact Mr. Monroe was so close and careful a buyer that they could not have afforded to take such a course, had they so desired. The firms whose representatives were examined with the result above reported, comprise such eminent and reputable names as Thurber, Whyland & Co., John S. Martin & Co., and H. D. Van Nostrand & Co., of New York city. Adding to this that Mr. Monroe denied under oath, in the most emphatic manner, ever having asked or received anything whatever in the way of bonus, commission or drawback from persons of whom he bought supplies for the Asylum, as well as his testimony that he had never saved above \$500 in any one year since his connection with the Asylum, and the fact that neither from the evidence nor from the suggestions of his accusers could anything be discovered to show that he had amassed any property disproportionate to his salary and position, we have the most justifiable grounds for affirming his entire honesty and fidelity to his trust in these particulars.

JUN 27 1962



The alleged instances of the procurement by the Warden of various articles of household and domestic use for his private needs out of the public supplies, are all entirely and satisfactorily refuted by the evidence and explanations produced on his behalf. These allegations were apparently due to misconstruction on the part of discharged employes of facts of which they had only very imperfect knowledge; and your committee are of the opinion that this misconstruction was not wholly devoid of a malicious and vindictive purpose towards Mr. Monroe.

The charges against the business management and conduct of the Asylum under Mr. Monroe's wardenship, though not preferred in the first instance by Dr. E. C. Booth, the Medical Director of the Asylum, were first formally stated to the committee by that officer. They were presented in writing. We quote here so much thereof as is necessary to show the charges made:

“FOOD.

“The first abuse in the management of the Asylum to which we call attention relates to the food of the attendants and patients. We do not hesitate to say *that in the last three years food has very frequently been supplied to feed our patients and their attendants* which was *unfit* to be supplied to human beings in any institution whatsoever. The fault in the food begins in the purchase of supplies. Large deliveries have been made to the Asylum of meat unfit for use, which ought never to have been accepted from the seller. The quality of the butter supplied has been usually very poor. The milk, eggs, oatmeal and other sundries have varied from time to time, but have often been bad. The evils arising from poor supplies have been aggravated by negligence and incapacity in the kitchen department. The preparation of food for so many people requires not only special skill and knowledge, but also intelligent and careful supervision. While there have been many faithful employes in the kitchen, who have done their best with the poor material furnished, yet the general management has been negligent and incompetent. The orders for special diet are among the most important duties of the physicians. If they are not obeyed, the physicians might as well be dispensed with. These orders can only be carried out through the kitchen. To carry them out requires care and system, but no more than is found in every well-conducted

hotel. Under the present system the physicians and attendants have found that they cannot rely on obedience to their directions, and this may be attributed partly to indifference to duty and partly to a willful disposition to show an independence of authority of the medical department. The instances of this character are very numerous and will be established by the supervisors and attendants. The negligence and lack of skill and system in the store-room and kitchen result in the sending to the wards of quantities of spoiled and wormy food, not only unfit, but dangerous to eat, which no sane person could eat. Details can be supplied by abundant evidence of the attendants, who have often refused to place before their charges the nauseous preparation sent up from the kitchen under the name of food. The food supplied is also deficient in quantity. This complaint arises chiefly in the male department, and details can be established by abundant testimony.

#### “THE LAUNDRY.

“Next in importance to the food of the patients is their clothing. Cleanliness is simply vital. The mismanagement of the laundry is equally striking with that of the kitchen. The amount of clothing destroyed or lost, often the property of private patients who pay liberally for their support, is too great to be overlooked or explained. This grievance is particularly felt among the female patients, and will be shown by lists made by attendants of goods lost or injured in the laundry. It is a very common thing for patients to receive packages by mail or express. To prevent the introduction of improper articles sent by injudicious friends it is necessary to supervise the opening of these packages. This is a very delicate duty, which needs to be exercised with tact, and, as a rule, by means of the kind personal relations between patients and attendants or physicians, the supervision can be exercised by them without annoyance to patients; and this was long the practice. Under the present management the packages are opened by the Warden before they come to the attendants, and this often causes much excitement and anger among the patients. The reason given for the change is that a record should be made of the property brought in by patients, but in the opinion of the physicians, if there were no better ground than this to break open these packages, it would be no more justifiable than for the proprietor of a hotel to ransack the baggage of his guests. The physicians and their assistants alone can judge what



articles each particular patient may properly receive, and they can also be trusted to attend to the important duty of furnishing a list of property which needs to be accounted for without going into details. As to other departments, we charge generally that the clothing supplied is insufficient in quantity and of a poor quality and of a uniform cut, needlessly irritating and therefore injurious to indigent patients. The tailor-shop is managed without the good results shown in former years to be easily attainable. The garden and farm do not furnish to the table of the Asylum the fresh and abundant supplies available from these sources under proper management. Repairs in the wards are long neglected, and when made are made or sometimes carried on without due regard to the comfort and convenience of the patients. The proper requisitions of the medical department for drugs, furniture and supplies for wards and patients are habitually neglected. That many of the single items which go to establish the charges are petty is inevitable."

To ascertain the truth concerning these charges formulated by Dr. Booth, your committee examined Dr. Booth himself and all the medical assistants then employed in the Asylum, together with almost all the supervisors, attendants and other employes in the medical branch of the institution, and many of the other persons either then or theretofore employed there. As the result and a summary of the evidence upon these points, we would report that, while it is not true that such frequent or gross delinquencies occurred in the kitchen, store-room or laundry departments as would be inferred from the language of Dr. Booth's charges, yet it is true that, dating principally from some time in the fall of 1887 and extending to a time near the commencement of our investigation, there were instances more numerous than is excusable of improper articles of food served out from the store-room and meat-house to the kitchen, and prepared and served to the patients and employes.

These articles include meat, oat-meal and eggs. To give an idea of the nature and frequency of such instances we refer to the evidence of Miss Julia Murphy, one of the supervisors. She kept a memorandum of occasions when improper food was served in her department. Her observations were begun to be noted down in June, 1887. The instances noted by her from June 6th, 1887, to the date of her testifying, April 17th, 1888, were as follows :

June 6th, hash condemned by Dr. Russell.

June 9th, oat-meal had worms in it.

June 9th, at dinner, milk was sour.

February 9th, 1888, sour oat-meal, continuing to February 16th.

February 26th, apple-sauce had worms and bugs in it.

March 6th, roast beef too rare to be eaten.

April 13th, potatoes soggy.

These are all the instances noted by her; though she says there were others she did not put down; that they only put down the unusually bad instances.

Dr. Andrew McFarlane, an assistant physician, also took notes. As he was somewhat active in pressing the charges contained in Dr. Booth's statement, we give here so much of his written testimony read to the committee as will show the instances that he deemed of enough importance to record:

"On February 27th, 1888, the mutton in 1-2 hospital ward, where old, sick and feeble men are confined, was tainted and not eaten; it smelled badly and was thrown in the swill barrel. The mutton stew in 3-4, about twelve weeks ago, was so tainted and had such a bad odor that it was thrown away. On March 5th the corned beef on 3-4 was most of it fat and gristle, with a bad odor, and was most of it not eaten. The beef-steak is usually very much overdone, and so dried up that there is no nourishment in it. March 25th the patients on 2-1 could not eat the roast beef because it was improperly prepared, being entirely too rare. The corned beef, if not tainted, is very uninviting, having much fat, gristle and bone, and often not near enough lean, good meat for the patients. This is almost always the case, and the meat has been very much complained of, especially about the mutton as being green and tainted.

"Now, about the extra meats. The roast beef that is ordered is usually uninviting, and invariably it is not properly prepared. There is a great deal of fat and gristle about it, and the lean meat is very small in comparison with the amount of the beef sent up. January 18th, 19th and 20th the roast beef that came up as extras for private patients on ward 3-1 north, was not fit to be eaten, over three-fourths of it was fat and gristle."

These records may be taken as affording a fair statement of the frequency of the instances when notably bad food was served. There



were doubtless other instances not recorded by these witnesses, perhaps not occurring in their departments. Taken in connection with the other evidence, too voluminous to be quoted, they go to show that there was a lack of care or supervision in the kitchen and store-room that resulted in the serving of improper food more frequently than is excusable. We believe that on at least two occasions meat was received at the Asylum that should have been rejected and returned to the seller. One was the lot of veal received in October, 1887, and the other was the lot of mutton received and used in February, 1888.

That any of it was used in an unfit state we think is due to the butcher and to the cook. It appears that Mr. Monroe's orders to the butcher were never to send any meat to the kitchen which was not in first-rate condition. It is hardly credible that Mr. Monroe would knowingly permit spoiled meat to be served; and the evidence of all the reliable witnesses goes to prove that he was not informed of these two specific instances.

We believe, also, that on several occasions worms may have been bred in oat-meal or flour, and served up to the patients in that condition. Also, that water bugs found their way into the food; that spoiled or stale eggs were sometimes given out; and that other articles of diet were sometimes spoiled or infested with foreign bodies. All these things will happen even in the best-regulated families, as every housekeeper knows. It is the frequency or infrequency of such things that determines the good or bad quality of the house-keeping.

From the fact that all the witnesses agree that the service and food had much improved in these particulars since the charges under examination had been made public, it is safe to infer that there was culpable fault theretofore in the kitchen management.

The quality of the cooking was also greatly complained of, and we think it very likely that in that matter there has been a good deal of just ground of complaint. During the period covered by the complaints which are in evidence, the kitchen was never under the charge either of a really competent cook or of a Steward. Had there been a competent cook, the complaints of overdone and underdone meats, poor beef-tea, &c., would not have been so frequent. Had there been a Steward to supervise and inspect all articles of food before they were cooked as well as after, there would have been little chance for the occurrence of those instances of complaint that have been referred to;

and had they occurred, the responsibility could have been fixed at once on the cook or Steward, and the recurrence of the complaint avoided.

During the progress of this investigation, and as soon as practicable after these complaints of bad food and bad cooking were brought out before the committee, the Board of Managers secured the services of a first-class cook and superintendent in the kitchen, and appointed a qualified store-keeper ; and we are glad to be able to assure the Legislature, that under these arrangements, the food is now prepared in a manner that is beyond criticism.

The inquiry naturally arises, why was not all this remedied before ? The Board of Managers are charged by law with the employment of proper officers and servants, as well as with the management and control of the whole institution. Prior to the year 1885, the Medical Director had the charge (of course under the control of the Managers) of the whole institution ; both the medical and the business department. In 1885, by act of the Legislature, it was provided that the Managers should appoint both a Medical Director and a Steward or Warden. The Medical Director was to have charge, direction and control of all the patients and of all persons engaged in the care of patients in the Asylum ; the Steward or Warden was to be the General Manager of the Asylum buildings, grounds, and farm, with the furniture, fixtures and stock thereto belonging, and to perform such other duties as should be assigned to him by the Managers, subject to the by-laws, rules and regulation prescribed by the Managers. This is what is known as the dual system. The *management* of the institution in both departments was vested in the Board of Managers, gentlemen appointed on account of their business capacity and high standing in the State, who serve without compensation. Both the medical and business departments were completely under their control. The Board has always comprised among its members, a large proportion of physicians, ranking among the most eminent in the medical profession of the State. The Legislature and the people of the State expected, and had a right to expect, that with the ample powers given them by law, these Managers would do whatever was necessary to make this institution a model among Asylums, and a source of pride, as it is an ornament, to the State. If reform was necessary in the kitchen, or laundry or anywhere else, the Managers were the agents of the State to make the reform, and it was the duty of any officer in the institu-



tion, having knowledge of faults or deficiencies, to report them to the Board for correction.

Your committee, upon receiving Dr. Booth's written presentment of delinquencies in the business department of the institution, very quickly, therefore, desired to find out why the Board of Managers had not corrected the evils complained of. They asked Dr. Booth if he had ever complained to the Board respecting the matters contained in his written charges, and detailed in his testimony. We copy here his evidence on that point :

"Q. Did you ever complain to the Board of Managers on this subject?

"A. I have complained to the Board of Managers of this.

"Q. Well, have you ever made formal complaint to the Managers?

"A. I did make formal complaint in, I think, October, 1886, a few months——

"Q. Was there any improvement after that?

"A. For a short time things were better; I think that they gave directions; that they endeavored to ameliorate matters, I am satisfied.

"Q. Have you never complained since then?

"A. Not to them as a Board, but I have told individual members from time to time, things were going about the same; I told Dr. Varick and Mr. Lewis about it; I often told Dr. Varick, who is now dead, and I have, I think, told other members.

"Q. There have been three or four physicians on the Board of Managers all the time, have there not?

"A. I should say so; yes, there have been several.

"Q. Dr. Jackson, Dr. Green, Dr. Varick, Dr. Clark?

"A. And Dr. Hendry.

"Q. Well, these matters are such as would be easily appreciated by a physician, are they not?

"A. I think so.

"Q. Why did not you present the matters formally to the Board, as often as you had occasion to complain?

"A. The Managers told me that matters would be remedied after making these formal charges—set charges.

"Q. The last formal complaint you made to the Board, was in October, 1886?

"A. Yes, sir.

"Q. Has there been any understanding between you and the Board of Managers, that you should make a report to them, when anything was in trouble?

"A. The Board of Managers have inquired how things were going on in the house, had not inquired otherwise, and I have never told the Board of Managers, in any one instance, things were going on well in the house; they would ask how things were going, and I have told them they were going just about the same; that, I think the gentlemen will say, has been my habitual and general remark; they have not asked me particularly about it, and I have not gone on to explain what was the state of things; I have a great many letters from friends, imploring me to let the patients themselves open their parcels.

"Q. Have you laid that matter before the management?

"A. Yes, sir; I laid that matter before Dr. Varick.

"Q. But not before the Board of Management?

"A. Not as a Board of Management; I have felt a little diffident in bringing frequent charges to the Board of Managers, since the failure of my charges in 1886; I felt the management would think I was captious and fault-finding, and I have endeavored to get along without, for that reason, and I believe it has been the only reason I have been able to stay for the time I have; I have put up with a great many things in that and other respects."

Mr. George A. Halsey, President of the Board of Managers, and Judge Banta and Dr. Green, members of the Board, testify that they never knew or heard of the complaints of bad food until the charges appeared in the newspapers just prior to the appointment of this committee.

We understand Dr. Booth to testify substantially that he never brought these complaints of bad food and cooking to the attention of the Board. He says something in an indefinite way about having told Dr. Varick, a former Manager, now deceased, about "these charges," but it is scarcely credible, and hardly in keeping with the high sense of public duty we know Dr. Varick to have possessed, to believe that Dr. Booth could have told him "that in the last three years food was frequently supplied to feed the patients and their attendants which was unfit to be supplied to human beings," and that Dr. Varick should not have taken prompt action to investigate



and remedy the evil, or at least to impart the information to his associates on the Board.

Dr. Booth gives as a reason for his failure to make complaint to the Board, a statement of the history of a complaint against the Warden, made in October, 1886, which he alleges was not properly investigated or considered. Remarking in passing, that nothing in that complaint related in any way to improper food or cooking, we give here the complaint of 1886, as then submitted in writing :

“(1) I charge the Warden with a disposition to carry on the affairs of the Asylum as if he were the only head, which, indeed, he has declared himself to be.

“(2) With encroaching upon the department of the Medical Director, and with contempt for his authority.

“(3) With discourtesy and insult towards the medical officers.

“(4) With breeding insubordination among the attendants and disaffection among the patients.

“(5) With hindering the successful operation of the institution by inefficient management of his own department, as regards supply of special diet to patients on physicians' orders, care of clothing while in the laundry and its return to the wards, attention to requisitions and orders from the Medical Director.

“(6) With unwarrantable interference of his subordinates in the management and discipline of the wards.”

It will be observed that five out of six of these specifications relate to matters of alleged encroachment and interference by the Warden in and upon the domain of the Medical Department. These charges were referred to a special committee consisting of Judge Banta, Dr. Varick, Dr. Jackson and Messrs. Halsey and Meeker. The action of the committee is thus detailed by Judge Banta in his testimony :

“On the 22d of October the committee met; Dr. Varick and Mr. Meeker were absent. Dr. Varick wrote me that he would not come, that he had an engagement which prevented him from coming. On that day the committee had before them Dr. Booth and Mr. Monroe; they heard the statements of both of those gentlemen, and I think that ended their investigation for that day. The next meeting of this committee was on the 27th of October. Dr. Varick was then

here; Mr. Meeker was absent on account of sickness in his family. Dr. Varick had been informed of what had been done, and I think Dr. Varick sent for Dr. Booth and Mr. Monroe, and in the presence of both of them, Dr. Varick, in his short and emphatic way, asked them if there was any difficulty in getting along in the future, and both of them said they thought there was no difficulty at all, and that ended the whole thing, and we supposed that they would in the future get along very nicely; we supposed that it was a mere matter of misunderstanding, or something of that kind, and there was really no report made by the committee of investigation; they supposed they were both men of sense and would use their sense in getting along pleasantly.

“From that time until the 7th of July, 1887, not a word of complaint was ever heard by any member of this Board, or, at any rate, not officially, not as a Board. Dr. Booth then made some complaint before the Board, the nature of which I do not understand, because I was not present at the time; but I know that a resolution was offered (I was then present) by Dr. Green that the Warden and Dr. Booth should confer, I think the resolution said, on the morning of each day, with regard to their duties and work. I think that resolution is on July 7th, and that was the last we ever heard of any complaints. No other complaints were ever made to the Managers. The Managers never heard of any bad food being furnished the institution. Officially, at any time, not one single word concerning bad food, or rotten eggs, or tainted beef, or wormy flour, or bad cooking, ever came before this Board. The Board simply understood the difficulty between the Warden and Dr. Booth to be one of conflict of authority or jurisdiction, and they supposed by smoothing over the rough edges, there would be no difficulty in their getting along.

“I read from the minutes of the meeting of the Board of Managers of July 7th:

“On motion, the following resolutions, by Dr. Green, were acted upon separately, and each passed by a unanimous vote:

“*Resolved*, That it shall be the duty of the Medical Director and the Warden to meet each other daily, at some regularly-appointed place and hour, to arrange and consult about the business and interests of the Asylum, in order that their separate departments may be harmoniously conducted.